Appeal: 09-7905 Doc: 13 Filed: 06/29/2010 Pg: 1 of 3

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 09-7905

JOHN DAVID SIMPSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

JOHNSON, Director, Virginia Department of Corrections; JOHN JABE, Deputy Director, Virginia Department of Corrections; WILLIAM P. ROGERS, Regional Director, Virginia Department of Corrections; ALTON BASKERVILLE, Warden, Powhatan Correctional Center; E. R. BASKERVILLE, Assistant Warden, Powhatan Correctional Center; SCHILLING, Virginia Department of Corrections, Services Director; GEORGE SMITH, Chief Dentist, Virginia Department of Corrections; DOCTOR HARLAND, Chief Dentist, Virginia Department of Corrections; BRUCE L. JANEK, Dentist, Powhatan Correctional Center; STEPHEN B. KOPELOVE, Chief Dentist, Powhatan Correctional Center; BRUCE HUZEK, Dentist, Powhatan Correctional Center; NURSE PAYNE, Dental Hygiene Nurse, Powhatan Correctional Center; OTHERS UNKNOWN,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Robert E. Payne, Senior District Judge. (3:05-cv-00876-REP)

Submitted: June 24, 2010 Decided: June 29, 2010

Before DUNCAN, AGEE, and DAVIS, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Appeal: 09-7905 Doc: 13 Filed: 06/29/2010 Pg: 2 of 3

John David Simpson, Appellant Pro Se. Richard Carson Vorhis, Senior Assistant Attorney General, Richmond, Virginia; John David McChesney, Elizabeth Martin Muldowney, RAWLS & MCNELIS, PC, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Appeal: 09-7905 Doc: 13 Filed: 06/29/2010 Pg: 3 of 3

PER CURIAM:

John David Simpson appeals the district court's orders denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2006) complaint and denying reconsideration. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Simpson v. Johnson, No. 3:05-cv-00876-REP (E.D. Va. Mar. 28, 2008; Aug. 6, 2009; Sept. 3, 2009). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED